



Simmons, B. R., & Bayliss, P. D. (2007). The role of special schools for children with profound and multiple learning difficulties: is segregation always best? . *British Journal of Special Education*, 34(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8578.2007.00449.x>

Early version, also known as pre-print

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1111/j.1467-8578.2007.00449.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8578.2007.00449.x)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

"This is the pre-peer reviewed version of the following article: BRITISH JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION Volume 34, Issue 1, March 2007, Pages: 19–24 which has been published in final form at 10.1111/j.1467-8578.2007.00449.x.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Title: The role of special schools for children with profound and multiple learning difficulties: is segregation always best?

Authors: Dr Ben Simmons and Dr. Phil Bayliss

Published: 2007 in British Journal of Special Education, 31 (4), pp. 733-745

Abstract

This paper presents an interpretivist, qualitative research project which intended to illuminate issues related to supporting 'inclusion' of children with profound and multiple learning difficulties in a special school for children with severe learning difficulties in the Southwest of England. The research found that, in spite of its reputation, the school struggled significantly to provide an appropriate learning experience for children with PMLD. The paper discusses the need for better staff training to improve current knowledge and skills and concludes by calling for a shift away from the view that special schools are always the best environment for children with PMLD.

Key words: PMLD, special education, segregation, inclusion

Word Count: 4926

Introduction: ‘Education for all’ and the segregation of a minority

Recent years have seen a shift in attitude in favour of inclusive education for children with various forms of learning difficulties and disabilities who have traditionally been located in special schools. Legislation in the form of the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act (2001) has enshrined children’s access to mainstream provision making the refusal of access on the grounds of disability/impairment of the child difficult. However, the recent Select Committee on Education and Skills report (2006) on Special Educational Needs has supported the general view that inclusive education may only go so far and that full-time mainstream opportunities for some children is unrealistic. Similarly, Baroness Warnock (2005) has recently challenged the extent to which inclusion can be achieved for all and has supported the future role of special schools. This view is further reflected in Government policy. Croll and Moses (2000) have highlighted how the Green Paper: Excellence For All Children - Meeting Special Educational Needs (DfEE, 1997) falls into the pattern of emphasising the need for inclusion for most children whilst reinforcing the segregation of a selected few by ‘protecting and enhancing specialist provision for those who need it’ (p9). More recently, the Special Educational Needs Code of Practice (2001) has stressed how local education authorities must comply with parents’ preference of school unless:

‘...the school is unsuitable to the child’s age, ability, aptitude or special educational needs, or the placement would be incompatible with the efficient education of the other children with whom the child would be educated, or with the efficient use of resources’ (Education Act 1996, in SENCOP 2001, p107).

Despite the above notions that special schools are the most appropriate educational setting for some children, the extent to which special schools actually meet the needs of children with profound and multiple learning difficulties (PMLD) is rarely questioned in the literature and a culture of ‘faith in special schools’ appears to be prevalent. Although the category of ‘PMLD’ is contested as a syndrome, it is often claimed that since such children operate at preverbal stages of development, in no way could mainstream schools contribute to ‘growth’ in such children as the lessons are far too advanced for their abilities (Foreman, Arthur-Kelly, Pascoe, & Smyth King 2004). This paper presents research from a different perspective. It highlights how the learning environment of one highly regarded special school for children with severe learning difficulties (SLD) in the Southwest of England provided an inappropriate learning environment for children with PMLD as a result of lack of staff knowledge and training. It also emphasises the social limitations of the school. The paper concludes by suggesting a more critical attitude towards special schools is needed as well as a reconsideration of the generalisation that children with PMLD cannot benefit from mainstream education.

Defining ‘profound and multiple learning difficulties’

Definitions of ‘needs’ are problematic. It is common to see ‘children with PMLD’ within a medical discursive practice which is located in concepts of ‘cognitive and sensory impairment’. The language of such descriptions are ‘loaded’ in that the core constructs of description are based on developmental models (e.g. ‘mental age’) which are contestable. Thus, within traditional terminology, children and adults with PMLD are seen as having the severest of cognitive impairments resulting in an extremely young mental age, often

compared to that of an infant at the preverbal stages of development (Aitken and Trevarthen 1997; Trevarthen and Aitken 2001) resulting in the earliest forms of non-verbal communicative abilities (Burford 1988; Nind and Hewett 2001). The World Health Organisation (1981) identifies such children as having an IQ below 20, giving a 10-year-old child a mental age of 6 months. In addition to their cognitive delays, children with PMLD also experience other forms of disability such as physical and sensory impairments. Such children are highly dependent on others for the most rudimentary care needs and deemed to require a lifetime of support (Carnaby and Cambridge 2002). Children labelled as having PMLD are often very diverse in their abilities and as such present as having very idiosyncratic behaviours. In order to understand the behaviour of children with PMLD, each child has to be considered in their own right since most have very individual ways of interacting with others.

Sharing a vision whilst understanding the ‘detail’

The recent White Paper - Valuing People (Department for Health, 2001) sets out the Government's commitment to improving the life chances of people with learning disabilities and reports how this commitment will be met by working closely with local councils, the health service, voluntary organisations and most importantly with people with learning disabilities and their families to provide new opportunities for those with learning disabilities to lead full and active lives. However, the extent to which the White Paper addressed the needs of people with PMLD was criticised by the PMLD Network (2001) who argued that Valuing People fails to:

- ‘use consistent terminology
 - *identify that children and adults with PMLD are amongst the most excluded people in our society*
 - *identify children and adults with PMLD as a priority group*
 - make any specific objective or sub-objective for people with PMLD
 - *identify family carers of children and adults with PMLD as a priority group*
- (PMLD Network 2001, p2).

For people with disabilities, the White Paper outlined the four key principles of Rights, Independence, Choice, and Inclusion but, as the PMLD Network state:

‘whilst the overall vision is the same as for their more able peer group, the detail for children and adults with PMLD is often different. Children and adults with PMLD have specific needs that call for specific initiatives. All too often, their needs are lost within the wider agenda’ (ibid, p3).

While the White Paper calls for ‘inclusion’, this is a hugely contested discourse for children and adults with PMLD. There is developing practice in the field but nowhere in the literature is there a call for ‘full-inclusion’ (i.e. full-time placement within a mainstream setting with all necessary adaptations and support) for these learners; instead a common model is to provide education within mixed ability groupings in existing special school provision with

some opportunities for mainstream engagement, where this is thought appropriate (Bayliss and Pratchett, 2003; Bayliss and Simmons, 2005). Inclusion is seen more in curriculum terms, contained within processes of interactive teaching (Nind and Hewett, 1994; 2001) or within the wider process of enhancing quality of life (Dee, Byers, Hayhoe and Maudslay, 2002) rather than ‘placement’ within mainstream settings. These positive innovations have shifted provision for children with PMLD away from the ‘special care class’ (Ouvry, 1987) towards inclusion within the ‘mainstream’ of special schools for children with severe learning difficulties. Some schools are moving beyond this to develop inclusive practice within wider mainstream settings, but this is not the focus of this paper.

The Study

The aim of the research reported in this paper was to explore how children with PMLD could be ‘included’ in the general classroom life of a Southwest special school designated for children with severe learning difficulties (SLD) in order to illuminate the ways in which the ‘detail’ of inclusive education could be actualised for children with PMLD. For the purpose of this project, inclusion was understood in terms of the extent to which the children with PMLD engaged with their social and educational environments. Opportunities for mainstream school placements for children with PMLD are extremely rare in Southwest England, hence the research was undertaken in a highly regarded special school. The school has been praised by Ofsted and the Learning and Skills Council for its ‘inclusive’ provision for children with severe and profound and multiple learning difficulties (i.e. the children with PMLD are no longer located in a PMLD-specific class) and has strong links with the local community by providing popular holiday clubs for children of all ages and abilities.

During fieldwork undertaken during 2003-2004, we were concerned with understanding the nature of educational provision for children with PMLD. Over the period of the fieldwork, the following questions emerged:

1. How does the school see the needs of children with PMLD?
2. What specific intervention strategies are adopted by the staff in order to support children with PMLD?
3. Have the teachers received any additional training to work with children with PMLD?
4. Are staff confident enough to work with children with PMLD?
5. Is peer interaction with children with PMLD facilitated? If so, how?
6. Are children with PMLD 'included' in the classroom?
7. To what extent do staff feel that children with PMLD could successfully be included in a mainstream school?

Methodology and Methods

Research methods were guided by an interpretive methodology and a grounded, ethnographic approach was adopted, making use of both participant and non-participant observations as well as informal and formal, semi-structured interviews (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2000; Crotty 2003; Randor 2002). The research was undertaken in two phases. The first phase was exploratory and illuminative, the purpose being to understand what inclusion meant for a child with PMLD within an SLD school. During this time participant and non-participant observations were undertaken for a period of 8 weeks. Acting as a learning support assistant in three different classrooms allowed one of the researchers to participate in the daily routine and life of the children in the school. Further, the participatory role helped reduce notions of observer reactivity. Periods of non-participatory observation allowed the researcher to step back and observe how other LSAs and teachers interacted with the children, and to observe the skills, techniques and intervention strategies used by adults. Field notes provided a wealth of examples of practice, and were discussed with adults during suitable free periods (break time, after school etc) to ensure authenticity. The second phase of the research consisted of a final round of non-participant observations for a day in each of the classrooms followed by a series of semi-structured interviews, the questions being based on the original research questions and the observation notes being used to provide prompts and maintain conversation, whilst also acting as a method for triangulating the notes with the opinions of the staff. Data analysis was undertaken through grounded methods and conclusions reached after submergence in the data to reveal themes and patterns (Ryan and Bernard 1994; Silverman 1993). The findings of this process are reported below.

Findings

From observations it was evident that some teachers had strong expertise in a variety of areas such as curriculum differentiation for those with SLD, as well as behaviour management strategies and techniques for motivating the children in class. The treatment of children with SLD was impressive, with a variety of monitoring systems and a wide range of intervention strategies. Unfortunately, after observing various members of staff in action it became apparent that many struggled to meet the needs of children with PMLD.

- 1) School staff lacked a sufficient understanding of 'PMLD' stemming from little opportunities for additional training resulting in inappropriate educational experiences.

It was clear that some members of staff (including senior management, teachers and learning support assistants) lacked an understanding of what constituted 'profound and multiple learning difficulties'. Terminological inconsistency was revealed during informal discussions and semi-structured interviews with staff, where the terms 'brain damage', 'severe needs', 'PMLD', 'global delay', 'complex disabilities' and 'cerebral palsy' were often used interchangeably. The need for clarity and consistency of terminology is essential so that 'the population of children and adults with PMLD can be counted and, more importantly, their needs can be fully understood' (PMLD Network, 2001, p4). Lack of understanding of 'PMLD' was reflected during observations of lessons, which were often inappropriate for children with PMLD. For example, during observations of one numeracy lesson an LSA was supporting a child with PMLD to use number fans. The teacher would ask the class to find a number between 1 and 9, and the children had to find the number on the fan and show the

number to the teacher. For the child with PMLD, the LSA would find the number for the child, put the fan in the child's hand and help the child raise the fan to show the teacher. Similar observations were made in other classes also.

The distinct lack of understanding of PMLD could be attributed to the lack of appropriate training opportunities. Apart from the deputy head teacher, all the interviewed staff protested about the lack of external training opportunities and claimed that their prior education and mainstream experiences were insufficient preparation for SLD/PMLD school life. Despite the claim from the deputy head teacher that 'there is strong cross-fertilization within the school and so we don't have to go out and get certificates', the confidence of individual staff members about their own abilities to provide an appropriate learning experience for children with PMLD was low, one teacher claiming that 'if staff want to learn more, then it's up to them personally to join a course off their own back – though we don't have time to do that at the moment', whilst another member of staff expressed concerns that she was 'wasting the valuable time of the kids with more serious difficulties'. In addition to lack of support for external training by the school, two members of staff discussed in some detail the immense workload they faced and the lack of time to do their own research on the subject. It was felt that workload relief would allow more time for staff to look into 'different disabilities' and participate in self-directed learning.

2) Teacher expectations of the progress of children with PMLD were low.

Given the lack of understanding, it was not surprising to hear the low opinions staff had towards the development and progress of children with PMLD in their classes. Understanding 'gains' for children with PMLD requires a shift in perception insofar as such

gains could be very small (longer eye contact, increase in alertness etc) and take long periods of time, but are significant gains nonetheless. However, the attitudes of most interviewed members of staff towards some children were negative. One teacher claimed that a child with traumatic brain injury 'was unable to do anything' and questioned why such a child was in the school at all. Another teacher was also of the opinion that some children in the school required greater support than could currently be offered and suggested an even more specialist setting was needed. Interestingly, it was the LSAs who were the most optimistic towards the abilities of those with PMLD and who could differentiate between subtle changes in children's behaviours and attach significance and meaning to such behaviours.

3) Social interaction between children with PMLD and school staff/peers was minimal.

Despite the high number of adults in relation to students (most classes had approximately 3-4 adults and 10 children), the duration and quality of social interaction between children with PMLD and others (adults and peers) was low owing to difficulties with peer behavior, teacher pressure to complete whole-class projects and physical barriers to interaction. Observations revealed that LSA behavior strategies largely consisted of one-on-one 'marking' in which an adult would monitor and stay with a child who often presents challenging behavior. With the older, larger and stronger children it was common to observe two LSA's 'marking' a child. Whenever the child's behaviour became disruptive (i.e. attempting to run out of the classroom, throwing chairs, hitting others, destroying materials such as displays etc) the LSA(s) would physically restrain the child. This behaviour (from both child and adult) was very common and much time was spent containing the behavior of some children, leaving the children with PMLD with little or no adult support for prolonged periods of time.

It was also common to see children with PMLD taking ‘time out’ in sensory corners in the classroom during busy periods when whole class displays had to be finished by a set deadline (i.e. during ‘literacy week’) or when the lesson was deemed too complex for children with PMLD. Children with PMLD were placed in sensory corners for entire lessons allowing staff to focus their efforts on supporting those children with SLD. Other barriers to social interaction included the physical design of the school. With a small playground, a climbing frame, a swing, a seesaw and little pavement space, the children with PMLD were left in the classrooms during break time since it was deemed that such children could not make use of the playtime facilities. During the interviews, when asked if social interaction of children with PMLD was facilitated, all members of staff, apart from the deputy head teacher, discussed the desire and attempts to facilitate social interaction, whilst stressing the difficulties such a task brings, the music therapist stating that: ‘it depends on the class...the tinies are only just learning about themselves and they do not know who others are. I think some children are not accepted as much as they could be, especially when you see them on their own at play time’, whilst a class teacher explained how: ‘there are not enough hands and you sometimes are unable to include them as much as you would have liked’.

- 4) All staff questioned the extent to which inclusive education could be achieved for children with PMLD.

All members of staff were questioned how far inclusive education could be achieved for children with PMLD. It is interesting to note however that the staff differed in their explanations over why including children in the mainstream sector was difficult.

The foundation teacher's concern was resource based and claimed that: 'I don't think it is realistic because a mainstream school doesn't have facilities to meet their needs and the variety of different things they need like physio, speech and medical needs'. She was also concerned about personal care, and claimed that 'you need more than one person with you for feeding and taking them to the toilet, and then there is the specialist equipment and winches and things'.

The music therapist questioned the ability of the mainstream teachers and claimed that: 'they're still struggling with autism and frightened of the not so major difficulties...the mainstream panic and ask for all the training in the world and sometimes it's just common sense'. This was a common opinion which interviewed staff adhered to and many discussed how the mainstream teachers found differentiating the curriculum difficult for moderate learning difficulties never mind PMLD.

Answers given by a newly qualified teacher focused on the reasons why children with PMLD should be included in mainstream schools. He asked the question: 'are we trying to include them for our sake or for their sake...I think there is a place but at PMLD stage it is fairly minimal because I think we are looking at the benefits of other children than those with PMLD'. He argued that children with PMLD need 'Intensive Interaction' (Nind and Hewett 2001) and claimed that this was 'impossible' in mainstream environments.

It was the deputy head teacher who was the most optimistic of the interviewed staff. Although she claimed that mainstream schools were reluctant to accept any children with 'communication difficulties' and argued that staff struggled to differentiate the curriculum for

the existing mainstream children, she argued that ‘there is no reason why inclusion of all children shouldn’t happen someday’ and concluded: ‘the future looks better’.

Discussion

Although the aim of the research was to illuminate how good practice was represented in an SLD school which catered for children with PMLD within the ‘regular’ SLD class, the research found that the school struggled to provide an adequate learning environment for children with PMLD. Concerned staff expressed a wish to understand children with PMLD more, but explained how they had neither time nor training opportunities available to advance their knowledge and skills. The school was geared towards supporting children with SLD and, in general, the lessons were aimed at developing ‘life skills’ within the context of the National Curriculum. Although worthwhile for children with SLD, children with PMLD require alternative understandings and curricular approaches which recognise the need to create an environment which supports development (in the form of moving the child through the preverbal stages of development) rather than trying to support skills which are beyond the comprehension of such children. By moving the children with PMLD into the SLD classes, staff explained how the children were now more visible, one teacher claiming that: ‘the children with PMLD are no longer hidden but are seen by all and this mixing them all up is a good thing’. However, in order for such processes to move beyond a symbolic gesture of ‘being seen’, it is important that the needs of the children with PMLD are recognised and met rather than trying to appropriate an inappropriate SLD curriculum since, in the words of the PMLD Network (2001), although the ‘vision’ is the same for all children, the ‘detail’ for those with PMLD is often different. The research undertaken for this project highlighted how

the vision was the same for all children in the school (i.e. that all children regardless of abilities should be educated together) but the ‘detail’ (that is, the route to providing an appropriate learning experience) was often lacking.

Observations and interviews revealed the distinct lack of social interaction between children with PMLD and others (adults/peers). Much time was spent on managing the behaviour of other children. When interaction with children with PMLD was observed, it was usual adult-directed in order to expose the child to a sensory experience (i.e. spraying water over the child’s face to convey the impression that it is raining). The appeal to a variety of senses is important to children with (and without) sensory impairments but the centrality of social interaction to human development must not be overlooked. Decades of literature has shown how social interaction is prerequisite to human development. More recently, the discovery of innate intersubjectivity (Trevarthen and Aitken 1997, 2001) and communicative abilities in children with PMLD (Nind and Hewett, 2001), along with a deeper understanding of intentionality in people with PMLD (Pratchett, 2005) has allowed the ‘detail’ of children with PMLD to be understood in terms of developing social and object awareness through interaction with others (parents, school staff, peers etc).

Conclusion

The difficulties the school in the study faced in providing appropriate educational opportunities for children with PMLD may not be unique to this school but reflect wider issues regarding knowledge of children with PMLD and attitudes towards their educational placements. Schools in our culture have developed, as a ‘raison d’être’, a competitive ethos

based on 'standards' and place great emphasis on meeting academic benchmarks. However, there are always going to be some children who are unable to compete and achieve the allotted benchmark. Because of this, the general view is that some children (i.e. those with PMLD) require alternative educational experiences in the form of special schools. This view is rarely challenged, but nor is the quality of special school placements for children with PMLD. This study highlights that, despite the best intentions of the staff, the quality of education that children with PMLD received was poor as a result of a lack of understanding of PMLD stemming from lack of training opportunities and resources. Given the attitudes of the staff towards progress that children with PMLD can make, and the view that children with PMLD are in no way includable in mainstream schools, it was perhaps not surprising to see that social interaction between children with PMLD and their peers was largely unsupported and that interaction with adults was based on the adult providing sensory stimulation in order to differentiate lessons designed for students with SLD. Given the practices of the special school – and the lack of progress deemed to be made by children with PMLD within the special school – then perhaps attitudes against inclusion are not surprising.

An alternative understanding, based on an interactionist perspective which sees the quality of social interaction as being central to the development of children with (and without) PMLD allows a shift away from the necessity of special schools and towards the development of strategies which support communities. An inclusive ethos which is based on interactions with adults and peers may foster the development of intersubjectivity as a foundation for learning, both in the academic sense, and in the sense of developing personhood. Recent research has suggested mainstream schools may be able to support gains in children with PMLD in ways that special schools are unable to, given the wealth of opportunities for peer interactions in the mainstream environment (Bayliss and Simmons, 2005; Foreman, Arthur-

Kelly, Pascoe, and Smyth King, 2004). Here, further empirical research is needed to understand how children with PMLD could benefit from inclusive practice which in turn may challenge existing practice within special school settings for children with PMLD.

Bibliography

Aitken, J. Kenneth, Trevarthen, Colwyn (1997) Self/other organization in human psychological development, Development and Psychopathology, 9, 654-677

Arthur, Michael (2004) Patterns Amongst Behaviour States, Sociocommunicative, and Activity Variables in Education Programs for Students With Profound and Multiple Disabilities, in Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities, 16 (2) 125-149

Bayliss, Phil and Pratchett, Glyniss (2004) Interim Report Scope/DfES Project Special Schools partnership programme. A report of the supported inclusion practices (Scope, UK) for children with PMLD in Devon. University of Exeter: School of Education and Lifelong Learning

Bayliss, Phil and Simmons, Ben (2003) The Inclusion of Children With Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties. University of Exeter: School of Education and Lifelong Learning, and Scope Inclusion, Saltash

Burford, Bronwen (1988) Action cycles: rhythmic actions for engagement with children and young adults with profound mental handicap, in European Journal of Special Needs Education, 3(4), 189-206

Carnaby, S., and Cambridge, P. (2002) Getting personal: an exploratory study of intimate and personal care provision for people with profound and multiple intellectual disabilities, in Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 46 (2) 120-132

Cohen, Louis; Manion, Lawrence and Morrison, Keith (2000) Research Methods in Education (5th Edition). London: RoutledgeFalmer

Croll, Paul and Moses, Diana (2000) Ideologies and utopias: education professionals' views of inclusion, in European Journal of Special Educational Needs, 15 (1) 1-12

Crotty, Michael (2003) The Foundation of Social Research. London: Sage Publications

Dee, L., Byers, R., Hayhoe, H. and Maudslay, L. (2002) Quality of Life Manual: Enhancing Quality of Life – facilitating transitions for people with profound and complex learning difficulties. London: University of Cambridge/Skill

DfEE (Department for Education and Employment) (1997) Excellence for all Children: Meeting Special Educational Needs. London: DfEE Publications

DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (2001) Special Educational Needs Code of Practice. Annesley: DfES Publications

DoH (Department of Health) (2001) Valuing People – A New Strategy for Learning Disability for the 21st Century. Norwich: Her Majesty's Stationery Office

Foreman, P., Arthur-Kelly, M., Pascoe, S. & Smyth King, B. (2004). Evaluating the educational experiences of students with profound and multiple disabilities in inclusive and segregated classroom settings: An Australian perspective. Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 29 (3), 183-193

Nind, Melanie and Hewett, David (1994) Access to Communication. London: David Fulton Publishers

Nind, Melanie and Hewett, David (2001) A Practical Guide to Intensive Interaction. Plymouth: British Institute of Learning Disabilities (BILD) Publications

OPSI (Office for Public Sector Information) (2001) Special Educational Needs and Disability Act. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO)

Ouvry, Carol (1987) Educating Children with Profound Handicaps. Kidderminster: British Institute of Mental Handicap (BIMH) Publications

PMLD Network (2001) Valuing People with Profound and Multiple Learning Disabilities (PMLD). Plymouth: British Institute of Learning Disabilities (BILD) Publications

Pratchett, G.B (2004) *'It's a Matter of Understanding.'* *A Study of Movement Behaviour* Patterns in Children with Profound, Complex and Multiple Learning Disabilities, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Exeter, School of Education and Lifelong Learning.

Randor, Hillary A. (2002) *Researching Your Professional Practice – Doing Interpretative Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Ryan W. Gery and Bernard, Russell H (1994) *Data Management and Analysis Methods*, in Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln Y.S. (Ed.) (1994) Handbook of Qualitative Research. London: Sage Publications

Select Committee on Education and Skills (2006) *Third Report on Special Educational Needs*. The Stationery Office. Retrieved online from: http://www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/education_and_skills_committee.cfm on 27th November 2006

Silverman, David (1993) *Interpreting Qualitative Data – Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Simmons, Ben and Bayliss, Phil (2005) *Developing intersubjectivity in children with profound and multiple learning difficulties: naturalistic classroom interactions and emerging other-object awareness*, Paper presented at the Second International Conference of Inclusive Education (ICIE2), Institute of Education, Hong Kong

Trevarthen, C. and Aitken, K. (2001) Infant intersubjectivity: research, theory and clinical application, in Journal Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 42(1), 3–48

Warnock, Mary (2005) Special Educational Needs – A New Look, in Impact No.11

Wood, P. (1981) International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps. Geneva: World Health Organisation